

Appl. No. 09/635,113
Final Amendment and/or Response
Reply to final Office action of 25 August 2004

Page 6 of 7

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application.

The Office action rejects claims 1-3, 6, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Rijckaert (USP 6,222,981). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-5 depend, claims a reproducing device comprising a tester that is configured to determine whether, during transport of a magnetic tape with a first trick-play speed, valid first trick-play reproduction data is reproduced, and to supply control information to a transporter in the absence of reproduced valid first trick-play reproduction data during a test interval, in order to cause a transport of the magnetic tape with a second trick-play speed.

Rijckaert does not teach a reproducing device that includes a tester that controls a tape transporter to cause the transport of the magnetic tape at a second trick-play speed when valid first trick-play data is not reproduced, as specifically claimed in claim 1.

The Office action notes that a user may control Rijckaert's reproducing device to change speeds. The applicant respectfully notes, however, that Rijckaert's reproducing device cannot be said to comprise such a user, whereas the applicant specifically claims that the claimed reproducing device comprises a tester that controls the transporter to effect the change of speed.

Claim 6, upon which claims 7-8 depend, claims a method of reproducing reproduction data recorded on a magnetic tape, including testing whether, during transport of the magnetic tape with a first trick-play speed, valid first trick-play reproduction data is reproduced, and in the absence of reproduced valid first trick-play reproduction data during a test interval, automatically moving the magnetic tape with a second trick-play speed.

Rijckaert does not teach automatically moving a magnetic tape at a second trick-play speed in the absence of valid first trick-play reproduction data during a test interval, as specifically claimed in claim 6.

Appl. No. 09/635,113
Final Amendment and/or Response
Reply to final Office action of 25 August 2004

Page 7 of 7

Claim 9 claims an apparatus comprising a controller that is configured to automatically adjust a playback device from a second playback speed to a third playback speed, based upon whether valid reproduction information is rendered from the media at the second playback speed.

Rijckaert does not teach a controller that automatically adjusts a playback device from a second playback speed to a third playback speed based on whether valid reproduction information is rendered from the media at the second playback speed, as specifically claimed in claim 9.

Because Rijckaert fails to teach each of the claimed elements of each of the claims, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Rijckaert.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott
Reg. 41,508
Atty for Applicant(s)

1824 Federal Farm Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: (804) 493-0707
Fax: (215) 243-7525